

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/747,987	LAUX ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Spisich	1744	

All Participants:

(1) Mark Spisich.

(2) Courtney Miller (Appl Rep).

Status of Application: amended (now allowed)

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 November 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

14 and 21

Prior art documents discussed:

none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested that claim 14 be amended to delete "at least" (claim 14, line 10) in that the scrub device is disclosed as being attached to either the base OR the handle and that claim 21 be amended because the "integral" embodiment in the disclosure was limited to the version attached to the base. Applicant agreed to the suggested amendment and these changes have been incorporated in the attached examiner's amendment.